

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 27, 2004, the Examiner suggested that the title of the invention was not descriptive, and that a new title be submitted which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Pursuant to the present amendment, the title has been amended so as to be properly descriptive.

The Examiner also objected to the disclose of the present application because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser/executable code. Again, pursuant to the present amendment, Applicants have herein amended the paragraph which begins on line 13 of page 4 so as to delete the sentence which contains the embedded hyperlink.

Claims 3-14, 16 and 20 remain in the present application. Claims 1-2, 15 and 17-19 have been canceled. New claim 20 has been added. The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 3-9, 12, 13 and 15 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 20 has been added which substantially reflects the combination of canceled claims 1 and 2, yet includes further clarification of the particular method steps. Similarly, independent claim 14 has been amended so as to include the limitations of dependent claim 15 along with additional clarification of the functionality of the various elements. Moreover, independent claim 16 has been amended so as to include the additional functionality operations of the various elements akin to claim 14.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7 of the present application under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner pointed out that there were certain method steps which were not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is newly connected to make and/or use the invention. Pursuant to the present amendment, accordingly, Applicants have respectively removed the portions of such claims cited by the Examiner. Similarly, the Examiner rejected claim 3 of the present application under this same section indicating that the limitation "the user" in line 5 had insufficient antecedent basis. Pursuant to the present amendment, Applicants have amended this passage so as to read "a user".

Applicants wish to begin the discussion with independent claim 14. Independent claim 14 has been amended so as to include the limitation of dependent claim 15. Given that the

Examiner has deemed dependent claim 15 to be allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 14 is now in allowable form.

With respect to independent claim 16, as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim which is directed to a "circuit arrangement" substantially encompasses all of the limitations of independent claim 14 as herein amended. Thus, for the reasons as set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 16 also is now in allowable form.

The Examiner further rejected, in particular, independent claim 1 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gibson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,167). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof. Again, Applicants wish to point out that independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2 have been combined in rewritten form as new independent claim 20. Such claim also includes further clarification as to the functionality of the various method steps. The following discussion should be considered in connection with new independent claim 20.

Pursuant to such claim, in a first step, program instructions of a bootstrap program from a bootstrap storage device, in a bootstrapping transmission program, are transmitted into an initial area of a working memory unit (main memory unit) with the assistance of a control circuit. In a second step, the processor copies the program instructions of the bootstrapping program from such initial area into an end area of the main memory unit. Thereafter, in a third step, the program instructions transmitted into the main memory unit during the bootstrapping transmission process are executed whereby a reload transmission process is executed for transmitting program instructions from a reload memory unit into the initial area of the main memory unit. The bootstrap storage device and/or the reload memory unit represent a storage unit having serial access or a storage device which requires a number of read accesses for reading a program instruction of the process.

Based upon this multi-step, intelligent method as reflected in new independent claim 20, it is possible that the bootstrap storage device and the reload memory unit may be configured as serial storage device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Gibson reference merely discloses the use of a serial memory as a bootstrap storage device in a computer system. The program instructions

stored in the serial memory are copied into a RAM (16) during the boot process. Gibson does not, however, teach or suggest anything as to exactly where in the RAM (16) the program instructions are stored. Specifically, there is nothing disclosed in Gibson to the effect that the program instructions, in a first step, are copied into an initial area and are copied in a second step, from the initial area, into an end area of a main memory unit. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Gibson does not teach or suggest, given an execution of the program instructions transmitted into the main memory unit during the bootstrap transmission program, that a reload transmission process is initiated for transmitting the program instructions from the reload memory unit into the initial area of the main memory unit.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Gibson reference does not teach or suggest, or even contemplate, the claimed method steps of new independent claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 20, as well as claims 3-13 which respectfully dependent therefrom, are both novel and not obvious over the art of record.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims of the present application, as amended, are patentable over the cited references, and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

It is further acknowledged that a one month extension of time of \$120.00 is due in connection with this response at this time. However, if any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-338) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 39,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: February 28, 2005